

Application No. 10/809,880
Amendment "A" dated September 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 12, 2005

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 12, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 11, 16, and 20-21 are amended, and , claims 1-23 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-12, 14, 15 and 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,524,123 (*Kedrowski*).

The Office Action indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 3 and any intervening claims and is therefore in condition for allowance. Claims 2-11, which depend from claim 1, are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action also indicated that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 16 and intervening claims and is therefore in condition for allowance. Claims 12-20, which depend from claim 11, are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Best Available Copy

Application No. 10/809,880
Amendment "A" dated September 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 12, 2005

Claim 20 has been amended to require positioning the subcomponent on the evaluator board so that a front end of the subcomponent electrically connects with one or more connection points extending out from the connection base and so that a back end of the subcomponent electrically connects with the edge connection receptacle. Further, both the edge connection receptacle and the connection base are mounted on the evaluator board.

Kedrowski does not teach the elements of claim 20 in the manner required by claim 20. For example, *Kedrowski* only teaches a connector 20 mounted to the board 25, while claim 20 requires both the connection base and the edge connection receptacle be mounted to the evaluator board. Because *Kedrowski* fails to teach or suggest this limitation, claim 20 is not anticipated by *Kedrowski*. Further, because *Kedrowski* does not teach this requirement of claim 20, the subcomponent cannot be electrically connected as required by claim 20. As a result, claim 20 overcomes the cited art and is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 21-23, which depend from claim 20, are in condition for at least the same reasons.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kedrowski* in view of United States Patent No. 6,064,195 (*Clayton*). Because claim 1 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 8 is also in condition for allowance as it depends from claim 1.

Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 3-5, 13 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have rewritten claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 3 as described above. Thus, the scope of claim 1 has not been narrowed in any way so as to overcome any prior art, but has merely been rewritten in an independent format. As acknowledged by the Examiner, that claim is patentably distinct from the prior art, and is now in a condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/809,880
Amendment "A" dated September 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 12, 2005

Similarly, claim 11 incorporates the limitations of claim 16 as described above. Thus, the scope of claim 16 has not been narrowed in any way so as to overcome any prior art. As acknowledged by the Examiner, that claim is patentably distinct from the prior art, and is now in condition for allowance. The dependent claims 2-10 and 12-19 depend from claim 1 and claim 11, respectively, and are now in condition for allowance as well.


Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicants do not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action. Applicants further reserve the right to challenge the characterization of the art made in the Office Action and make no admission as to whether the cited art anticipates the claims as originally filed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 10th day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



CARL T. REED
Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

CTR/tat

WA15436325TAT0000001438V001.doc